UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,319	05/30/2001	Debasish Banerjee	ROC920010082US1	7641

46797 7590 09/27/2006

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER	
BAYARD, DJENANE M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2141	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/870,319	BANERJEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Djenane M. Bayard	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 June 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *10-20,33-42,45-47,50 and 51* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *10-20,33-42,45-47,50 and 51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/24/06*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to amendment filed on 6/22/06 in which claims 10-20, 33-42, 45-47 and 50-51 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argues that DellaFera fails to teach "processing first request using internationalization context extracted from a second request, attaching the internationalization context extracted from the second request, attaching the internationalization context to the fist request, and propagating the first request with the attached internationalization context to an application associated with an application interface on a second server". However, DellaFera teaches wherein "the request manager keeps track of local active request. Ideally, the request manager keeps track of all currently active request made by any local client. For Example, ideally the request manager tracks the request made by end-user and any request made by other process in fulfilling the end-user's requests" (see col. 4, lines 61-67). Furthermore, DellaFera teaches "When an RPC is received, the request manager local to the receiving server records: 1) the request-id; 2) the request context; and 3) the server processing the request (See col. 5, lines 7-12). If the request manager receives a request without a request-id (i.e., with a NULL request-id) it assumes that it is being asked to become the originating request manager for that request. The now-originating request manager is responsible for generating a request-id and any initial request context for the newly created request. Each request manager maintains a list or index of all the data it has gathered. Specifically, lists are maintained for: 1) all requests made; 2) the

client or server on which the request executed; 3) the associated request-context. This data maintained by the request managers may be accessed and manipulated by defining and using an appropriate interface. The data can be accessed at any time in order track and manage requests." (See col. 5, lines 13-36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 10-20, 33-42, 45-47 and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JavaServer Pages by Hans Bergsten in view of U.S. patent Application No. 5,404523 to DellaFera et al.

a. As per claim 10 and 45, Bergsten teaches a method operative in a distributed computing environment having clients and a plurality of servers located across geographically dispersed boundaries, comprising: receiving a first request from a client at a server (See Section 11.1.1, A browser can send a request for a web resource); receiving a second request from the client at the server, wherein the second request comprises an internationalization context for processing the first request (See Section 11.1.1 A browser can send an Accept –Language header with a request for a web resource) extracting the internationalization context from the second request; and

processing the first request at the server using the internationalization context (See Section 11.1.1, The getLocale () method returns the locale with the highest preference ranking and the get locales() method returns an enumeration of all locales in order in preference). However, Bergsten fails to teach a request to invoke a Remote procedure call.

DellaFera et al teaches a method of managing request in a transaction processing system. Furthermore, DellaFera et al teaches wherein the (21) Control automatically passes to block 103 where the RPC is received by a server and the request-context is un-marshalled. This allows the server to examine the request-context before processing. In one embodiment of the invention, the un-marshalling is accomplished by calling a special un-marshalling routine. At this time, any necessary work is accomplished to re-establish the context in which the request was originally made (for example: setting privileges, acquiring resources, etc.). Control automatically passes to block 104 where the un-marshalled request-context is stored and passed along. More specifically, the request-context is stored in the server's thread context and a copy is passed to the server's local request manager. Control automatically passes to decision block 105 where it is determined if the server has fully serviced its current request (the request sent from its client) or if the server requires assistance from another server. If the server requires assistance then control passes to block 106 where an RPC is issued and the request-context is pulled from the server's context thread and marshalled into the outgoing call. In one embodiment, a marshalling routine is called when the RPC is issued; the marshalling routine pulls the request-context from the server's context thread and marshals it into the RPC. From block 106, control automatically passes to block 107 where control is automatically passed to block 103. At block 103, a new server receives the new RPC and the process proceeds as described above. Moving

back to decision block 105, if the server completes service of the current request then control passes to block 108. At block 108, the RPC call chain unwinds and begins to return to the end-user client (See col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 5, lines 6-36, 57-67 and col. 6, lines 1-24).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of DellaFera in the claimed invention of Bergsten in order to uniquely identify, track and manage end-user requests as they propagate throughout the transaction processing system and to allow a server in the path of execution of the end-user request to access the standard input and output operation on the standard input and output of the end-user client (See col. 2, lines 64-67 and col. 3, lines 1-2).

b. As per claim 33, Bergsten teaches a method operative in a distributed computing environment having clients and a plurality of servers located across geographically dispersed boundaries, comprising: receiving a first request from a client at a server (See Section 11.1.1, A browser can send a request for a web resource);receiving a second request from the client at the server, wherein the second request comprises an internationalization context for processing the first request (See Section 11.1.1 A browser can send an Accept –Language header with a request for a web resource) extracting the internationalization context from the second request; and processing the first request at the server using the internationalization context (See Section 11.1.1, The getLocale () method returns the locale with the highest preference ranking and the get locales() method returns an enumeration of all locales in order in preference). However, Bergsten fails to teach a request to invoke a Remote procedure call.

DellaFera et al teaches a method of managing request in a transaction processing system. Furthermore, DellaFera et al teaches wherein the Control automatically passes to block 103 where the RPC is received by a server and the request-context is un-marshalled. This allows the server to examine the request-context before processing. In one embodiment of the invention, the un-marshalling is accomplished by calling a special un-marshalling routine. At this time, any necessary work is accomplished to re-establish the context in which the request was originally made (for example: setting privileges, acquiring resources, etc.). Control automatically passes to block 104 where the un-marshalled request-context is stored and passed along. More specifically, the request-context is stored in the server's thread context and a copy is passed to the server's local request manager. Control automatically passes to decision block 105 where it is determined if the server has fully serviced its current request (the request sent from its client) or if the server requires assistance from another server. If the server requires assistance then control passes to block 106 where an RPC is issued and the request-context is pulled from the server's context thread and marshalled into the outgoing call. In one embodiment, a marshalling routine is called when the RPC is issued; the marshalling routine pulls the request-context from the server's context thread and marshals it into the RPC. From block 106, control automatically passes to block 107 where control is automatically passed to block 103. At block 103, a new server receives the new RPC and the process proceeds as described above. Moving back to decision block 105, if the server completes service of the current request then control passes to block 108. At block 108, the RPC call chain unwinds and begins to return to the end-user client ((See col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 5, lines 6-36, 57-67 and col. 6, lines 1-24).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of DellaFera in the claimed invention of Bergsten in order to uniquely identify, track and manage end-user requests as they propagate throughout the transaction processing system and to allow a server in the path of execution of the end-user request to access the standard input and output operation on the standard input and output of the end-user client (See col. 2, lines 64-67 and col. 3, lines 1-2).

c. As per claim 11 and 34, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches wherein the resource manager comprises an application, which is configured to use the internationalization context to perform calculations and return a result formatted according to a specification of the internationalization context (See Section 11.1).

d. As per claims 12 and 35, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches wherein the internationalization context is transmitted by the server to at least one of the plurality of nodes in the distributed computer environment (See Section 11.1).

e. As per claims 13 and 36, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches wherein the internationalization context contains a country identification (See Section 11.1).

f. As per claims 14 and 37, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches wherein the internationalization context comprises locale information and a time zone identifier (See Section 11.1).

g. As per claims 15 and 38, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches wherein the internationalization context contains a time zone identifier (See Section 11.1).

h. As per claims 16, 39 and 46, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches wherein the internationalization context contains at least a locale specification and a time zone identifier (See Section 11.1)

i. As per claims 17 and 40, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches wherein the locale specification comprises at least one of a country identifier, a language identifier and a currency identifier (See Section 11.).

j. As per claim 18 and 41, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches processing the first request according to a

country identifier of the server if the internationalization context does not contain a country identifier (See Section 11.1)

k. As per claim 19, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches processing the first request according to a universal time zone identifier if the internationalization context does not contain a time zone identifier of the client (See Section 11.1).

l. As per claims 20 and 42, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches processing the first request according to a time zone identifier of the server if the internationalization context does not contain a time zone identifier (See Section 11.1).

m. As per claim 47, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches sending a first main body of the first request to the thread (See Section 11.2).

n. As per claim 50, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches wherein the thread comprises a legacy application thread (See Section 11.2).

o. As per claim 51, Bergsten in view of DellaFera et al teaches the claimed invention as

described above. Furthermore, Bergsten teaches wherein the internationalization component comprises culture sensitive information (See Section 11.1).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M. Bayard whose telephone number is (571) 272-3878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Djenane Bayard

Patent Examiner

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER